

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of EMMANUEL THOMAS
BULLOCK and DEMONTE LAMAR
BULLOCK, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WYKISHA TYANE BULLOCK,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CLARENCE ARTHUR WILLIAMS, JR. and
CHACOBRON LAMON DYE,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED

October 3, 2006

No. 267910

Genesee Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 2000-112736-NA

Before: Borrello, P.J., and Jansen and Cooper, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to her minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j).¹ We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument. MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent-appellant contends that the trial court erred in finding that clear and convincing evidence supported the statutory grounds for termination of her parental rights. We disagree. To terminate parental rights, a trial court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds contained in MCL 712A.19b(3) has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). The children were removed from respondent-appellant's care after she abandoned them with her own mother, an improper

¹ Respondents Williams and Dye, the children's respective fathers, are not parties to this appeal.

caretaker who had a history of abuse and neglect of her own children. Respondent-appellant thereafter received numerous services, and after some progress, the children were returned to her care where they suffered further neglect. The children were again removed from respondent-appellant's care and respondent-appellant received more services, including substance abuse treatment and treatment for bipolar disorder. Although respondent-appellant was in a residential program immediately before termination, she had shown no lasting progress in the nearly six years since adjudication, and the evidence indicated that she was unlikely to be able to parent adequately in the foreseeable future. Moreover, the record indicated that each time respondent-appellant left the confines of a structured residential program, she relapsed into a pattern of further substance abuse. The trial court, therefore, did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination had been established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

For the same reasons, the record supports the trial court's finding that termination was not clearly contrary to the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357. The evidence failed to demonstrate that respondent-appellant would ever be able to maintain a stable home environment, remain sober, or adequately parent the children. We find no clear error in the trial court's best-interests determination.

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello
/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Jessica R. Cooper